



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,906	07/02/2003	Eric W. Kramer	102.116	7188
7590	06/09/2005		EXAMINER	
Gordon E. Gray III GRAY LAW FIRM Suite 233 4401 N. Atlantic Avenue Long Beach, CA 90807			HUSAR, STEPHEN F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2875	
			DATE MAILED: 06/09/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/613,906	KRAMER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Stephen F. Husar	2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 6,12,14,16 and 17 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,4,5 and 7-11 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 3,13,15 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/2/03, 2/4/05.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 2/4/05 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Objections

1. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: it appears that "perimeter wing" in line 1 of claim 15 should be "perimeter ring". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1,2,4,5, and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conway et al. (6149283) in view of English et al. (6682211). Conway et al. shows the invention substantially as claimed in Fig.1 with a plurality of LEDs "19,21,23" supported on perimeter structure which supports a deflection cap "30" that deflects light from the LEDs into mixing chamber-the space between the deflection cap "30" and the opening adjacent the perimeter ring "32". Conway et al does not show covering one end of the mixing chamber with a lens. English et al. shows in Fig.1, a ring of LEDs directing light towards a deflection cap "12" which deflects light outwardly into a mixing chamber which is covered at one end by a lens which may be clear or colored for the purpose of protecting the lamp interior from external elements or coloring the blended light from the LEDS "22". It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a lens cover over one end of Conway et al's. light mixing chamber as taught by English et al. for the purpose and advantage of

protecting the lamp's interior from external elements as well as coloring the blended light from the plurality of LEDs. Re claim 2, see Conway et als. LEDs "19,21,23". Re claim 4, note Conway et als. red, green, and blue LEDs mix to provide white light or any other desired color (see abstract). Re claim 5, note the perimeter edge of English et als. lens "14". Re claim 11, note in English et al. that at least one side of lens "14" is convex in shape.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 6,12,14,16, and 17 are allowed.
7. Claims 3,13, and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claims 3, 6, 13, and 15 recite that the perimeter structure has an interior diameter greater than the interior diameter of the light deflection cap which is not shown or taught in the prior art. Claims 12 ,14,16 and 17 recite that the perimeter ring and deflection cap further define a plurality of light ports, which is not shown or taught in the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen F. Husar whose telephone number is 571-272-2371. The examiner can normally be reached on M-W and F from 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on 571-272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stephen F. Husar
Stephen F. Husar
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2875

SFH